

## REMARKS

In paragraph 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner stated that claim 10, as amended, was directed toward an invention that is independent and distinct from the invention as originally claimed because it contains species that have not been elected (molybdenum base particles). Accordingly claims 10 and its dependent claims 11-13 were withdrawn from consideration as being directed toward a non-elected invention, and claims 1, 3 and 9 are being examined on the merits.

In paragraph 7 of the Office Action, claims 1 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter regarded as the invention. With regard to claim 1, the Examiner stated that if the trademark or trade name is used in a claim as a limitation to identify or describe a particular material or product, the claim does not comply with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. Claim 9 was rejected as being dependent on claim 1.

In paragraph 9 of the Office Action, claims 1 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The Examiner pointed out that claim 1 recites LMG-30E ®, having a minimum concentration of 25% magnesium, however, the instant specification provides for LMG-30E ® having 30% of useful magnesium (pg. 10, lines 13,14). On page 16, line 4, a corrosion inhibitor having 25% of magnesium is indicated, however, it was not indicated as being LMG-30E ®. Claim 9 was rejected as being dependent on claim 1.

Allowable Subject Matter

In paragraphs 10 and 11 of the Office Action, under the heading “Allowable Subject Matter”, claims 1 and 9 were deemed to be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, first and second paragraphs and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. The Examiner indicated that **the prior art does not teach or suggest that in addition to graphite particles and specific corrosion inhibitor, an aromatic solvent is involved in the process of on-line cleaning gas turbine surfaces.**

Claim 1 has been amended to recite that the oil soluble magnesium carboxylate corrosion inhibitor has a minimum concentration of 30% magnesium, to conform the claim to the specification, and the use of the trademark “LMG-30E ®” to identify the oil soluble magnesium carboxylate corrosion inhibitor has been eliminated. Amended claim 9 depends directly from base claim 1 and includes all of the limitations of the base claim. The ratios recited in claim 9 have been amended to incorporate the aromatic solvent.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that provisionally allowable claims 1 and 9, as now amended, overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, first and second paragraphs, and include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims, and should now be allowable claims.

Additionally, the specification has been amended to properly identify the trademark “LMG-30E ®” by its generic terminology (an oil soluble magnesium carboxylate corrosion inhibitor) wherever it appears accompanied by an identification of the source, and on page 16, line 4, to properly recite that the preferred oil soluble magnesium carboxylate corrosion inhibitor has a minimum concentration of 30% magnesium. No new matter has been added. Support for

the amendatory language is found on pages 10, 12, and 16 of the specification as originally presented.


Claim 3 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by GB 839762. Claim 3 has been canceled. Further discussion of the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 102 based on the GB 839762 reference is believed to be moot, since amended base claim 1 and depending claim 9 contain subject matter deemed to be provisionally allowable by the Examiner.

Accordingly, in view of the foregoing amendments, explanations and remarks it is respectfully requested that this amendment be accepted and entered, and that claims 1 and 9, as amended, be reconsidered and allowed.

Request for Telephone Interview

It is submitted that this amendment overcomes the rejections under Section 112 and places the application in condition for allowance, however since the present Office Action was made final, if there are still any unresolved issues regarding compliance of the claims or specification under Section 112, it is requested that the undersigned agent be contacted by telephone in order to resolve such matters.

Respectfully submitted,



Kenneth A. Roddy  
Agent for Applicants  
Registration No. 31,294  
Telephone (713) 686-7676

September 18, 2006

2916 West T.C. Jester  
Suite 100  
Houston, TX 77018  
(713) 686-7676